

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

**DIAMOND RESORTS INTERNATIONAL,  
INC., *et al.*,**

## Plaintiffs

REED HEIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC, *et al.*

## Defendants

Case No.: 2:17-cv-03007-APG-VCF

## **Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part TET and Happy Hour's Motions to Dismiss**

[ECF Nos. 87, 88, 104]

Plaintiffs Diamond Resorts, International, Inc. (DRI); Diamond Resorts Corporation (DRC); Diamond Resorts U.S. Collection Development, LLC (US Collection); and Diamond Resorts Management, Inc. (DRM) (collectively, Diamond) allege that the defendants falsely claimed to consumers that they had a proprietary method to “exit” timeshare agreements with Diamond, when in reality they had no such method and often resorted to breaching the agreements. Diamond asserts causes of action for intentional interference with existing contractual relations, intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, direct and contributory false advertising in violation of the Lanham Act, violations of the Nevada Deceptive Trade Practices Act (NDTPA), and civil conspiracy.

Judge Richard F. Boulware dismissed all of Diamond's claims except for its intentional interference with contractual relations claim, but he granted leave to amend. Diamond filed an amended complaint adding parties and claims.<sup>1</sup> Defendants Brandon Reed, Trevor Hein, Thomas Parenteau, Reed Hein & Associates, LLC dba Timeshare Exit Team (TET) (collectively,

<sup>1</sup> The amended complaint was not filed in a searchable format. Local Rule IA 10-1(b) requires documents filed electronically to be in a searchable format. The parties are advised to comply with this and all other Local Rules going forward.

1 the TET defendants), and Happy Hour Media Group, LLC (Happy Hour) move to dismiss  
2 Diamond's amended complaint. I grant the motions in part because Diamond fails to allege that  
3 DRI, US Collection, and DRM have standing and fails to plead its NDTPA claim with the  
4 requisite specificity. But I deny the motions in all other respects.<sup>2</sup>

5 **I. BACKGROUND<sup>3</sup>**

6 Diamond develops, owns, operates, and manages vacation membership resorts.<sup>4</sup> It sells  
7 timeshare interests in those resorts, which require purchasers to pay maintenance fees and annual  
8 assessments in perpetuity.<sup>5</sup> Purchasers contract directly with Diamond-owned development  
9 entities or with US Collection.<sup>6</sup>

10 As its name "Timeshare Exit Team" suggests, TET offers a "'cancellation' or 'exit'  
11 service that purports to 'guarantee' a 'safe' and 'legitimate' termination" of timeshare  
12 agreements with companies like Diamond.<sup>7</sup> Defendants Reed and Hein co-founded TET.<sup>8</sup> Reed  
13 is TET's Chief Executive Officer, and defendant Parenteau is TET's Chief Operating Officer.<sup>9</sup>  
14 Reed and Hein formed Happy Hour as TET's "in-house marketing agency."<sup>10</sup>

---

15 <sup>2</sup> Diamond moves for leave to file a notice of supplemental authority regarding *Wyndham*  
16 *Vacation Ownership v. Reed Hein & Assocs.*, LLC, No. 6:18-CV-02171-GAP-DCI, 2019 WL  
17 3934468 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 20, 2019). ECF No. 104. Having reviewed the motion and the  
defendants' opposition, I deny Diamond's motion. But that does not mean I cannot review  
relevant legal authority to the extent I find it persuasive.

18 <sup>3</sup> The facts set forth below are a summary of Diamond's allegations relevant to the motions filed  
19 by the TET defendants and Happy Hour.

20 <sup>4</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶ 7.

21 <sup>5</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 7, 34.

22 <sup>6</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 7, 9.

23 <sup>7</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 36.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 135-136.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 136-137.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 20.

With Happy Hour's assistance, TET solicits timeshare owners through its website, on the radio, on social media, in newspaper articles, and through paid endorsements.<sup>11</sup> As relevant here, these advertisements include claims that: (1) TET provides "exit" or "cancellation" of a timeshare agreement; (2) TET has a "process" or "method" that results in termination of a timeshare agreement without obligations; (3) TET offers a "legal," "lawful," "legitimate," or "safe" method of terminating a timeshare agreement; (4) TET offers "guaranteed" means of terminating a timeshare agreement; and (5) TET's service allows owners to stop paying fees, mortgage payments, or other contractual obligations.<sup>12</sup> Diamond's amended complaint identifies specific statements on TET's website that fall into each of these categories.<sup>13</sup>

Diamond alleges that each of these representations is false or misleading because, among other reasons, Diamond's consent is required to terminate a timeshare agreement in the manner TET's advertisements promise.<sup>14</sup> Instead, TET's exit methods include breach of the timeshare agreement, resulting in foreclosure and a severe negative impact to the purchaser's credit.<sup>15</sup>

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. Standard

A properly pleaded complaint must provide a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief."<sup>16</sup> While Rule 8 does not require detailed factual allegations, it demands more than "labels and conclusions" or a "formulaic recitation of the

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 38-41, 94.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 97.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 100.

<sup>16</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2); *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007).

1 elements of a cause of action.”<sup>17</sup> “Factual allegations must be enough to rise above the  
2 speculative level.”<sup>18</sup> To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must “contain[] enough facts to  
3 state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.”<sup>19</sup>

4 District courts must apply a two-step approach when considering motions to dismiss.<sup>20</sup>  
5 First, the court must accept as true all well-pleaded factual allegations and draw all reasonable  
6 inferences from the complaint in the plaintiff’s favor.<sup>21</sup> Legal conclusions, however, are not  
7 entitled to the same assumption of truth even if cast in the form of factual allegations.<sup>22</sup> Mere  
8 recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported only by conclusory statements, do not  
9 suffice.<sup>23</sup> Second, the court must consider whether the factual allegations in the complaint allege  
10 a plausible claim for relief.<sup>24</sup> A claim is facially plausible when the complaint alleges facts that  
11 allow the court to draw a reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the alleged  
12 misconduct.<sup>25</sup> Where the complaint does not permit the court to infer more than the mere  
13 possibility of misconduct, the complaint has “alleged—but it has not shown—that the pleader is  
14 entitled to relief.”<sup>26</sup> When the claims have not crossed the line from conceivable to plausible, the  
15 complaint must be dismissed.<sup>27</sup> “Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for

---

16  
17 <sup>17</sup> *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

18 <sup>18</sup> *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

19 <sup>19</sup> *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 696 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 679.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*; *Brown v. Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 724 F.3d 1235, 1247–48 (9th Cir. 2013).

<sup>22</sup> *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679; *Brown*, 724 F.3d at 1248.

<sup>23</sup> *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.* at 679.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 663.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 679 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

<sup>27</sup> *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570.

1 relief will . . . be a context-specific task that requires the [district] court to draw on its judicial  
2 experience and common sense.”<sup>28</sup>

3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b)’s particularity requirement applies to Diamond’s  
4 false advertising<sup>29</sup> and NDTPA claims sounding in fraud.<sup>30</sup> “Rule 9(b) requires a party to state  
5 with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake, including the who, what,  
6 when, where, and how of the misconduct charged.”<sup>31</sup> Additionally, “[t]he plaintiff must set forth  
7 what is false or misleading about a statement, and why it is false.”<sup>32</sup> In sum, the plaintiff “must  
8 provide enough detail to give [the defendants] notice of the particular misconduct which is  
9 alleged to constitute the fraud charged so that [they] can defend against the charge and not just  
10 deny that [they have] done anything wrong.”<sup>33</sup>

## 11       **B. Standing**

12       The moving defendants argue that DRM, DRI, and US Collection do not have standing  
13 because Diamond alleges that DRC “ultimately subsumes all the losses of its underlying  
14 development entities, and therefore, all of the damages, both current and future, as a result of  
15 litigation are encapsulated with DRC.”<sup>34</sup> Diamond responds that DRM, DRI, and US Collection

---

16  
17  
18<sup>28</sup> *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679.

19<sup>29</sup> See *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1103 (9th Cir. 2003) (claims sounding in  
fraud are subject to Rule 9(b)).

20<sup>30</sup> See *Horner v. Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc.*, 711 F. App’x 817 (9th Cir. 2017) (citing  
*Kearns v. Ford Motor Co.*, 567 F.3d 1120, 1124-25 (9th Cir. 2009)) (Rule 9(b) standard applies  
21 to fraud-based NDTPA claim).

22<sup>31</sup> *Ebeid ex rel. U.S. v. Lungwitz*, 616 F.3d 993, 998 (9th Cir. 2010) (quotation omitted).

23<sup>32</sup> *Id.* (quotation omitted).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* at 999 (quotation omitted).

<sup>34</sup> ECF No. 87 at 5 (quoting ECF No. 59 at ¶ 7).

1 each has a financial interest in the matter and that the allegation does not refer to DRM, DRI, and  
2 US Collection because they are not development entities.<sup>35</sup>

3       “Article III of the Constitution limits the jurisdiction of federal courts to ‘Cases’ and  
4 ‘Controversies.’”<sup>36</sup> “A suit brought by a plaintiff without Article III standing is not a case or  
5 controversy, and an Article III federal court therefore lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the  
6 suit.”<sup>37</sup> The “irreducible constitutional minimum” of Article III standing consists of three  
7 elements.<sup>38</sup> “The plaintiff must have (1) suffered an injury in fact, (2) that is fairly traceable to  
8 the challenged conduct of the defendant, and (3) that is likely to be redressed by a favorable  
9 judicial decision.”<sup>39</sup>

10       As the party invoking this court’s jurisdiction, Diamond bears the burden of establishing  
11 these elements.<sup>40</sup> Each of these elements “must be supported in the same way as any other  
12 matter on which the plaintiff bears the burden of proof, i.e., with the manner and degree of  
13 evidence required at the successive stages of the litigation.”<sup>41</sup> “At the pleading stage, general  
14 factual allegations of injury resulting from the defendant’s conduct may suffice, for on a motion  
15 to dismiss [I] ‘presum[e] that general allegations embrace those specific facts that are necessary  
16 to support the claim.’”<sup>42</sup>

17  
18

---

<sup>35</sup> ECF No. 96 at 5-7.

19<sup>36</sup> *Lance v. Coffman*, 549 U.S. 437, 439 (2007).

20<sup>37</sup> *Braunstein v. Arizona Dep’t of Transp.*, 683 F.3d 1177, 1184 (9th Cir. 2012) (quotation  
omitted).

21<sup>38</sup> *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1547 (2016) (quotation omitted).

22<sup>39</sup> *Id.*

23<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561 (1992).

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* (quoting *Lujan v. Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n*, 497 U.S. 871, 889 (1990)).

1 Diamond's amended complaint includes numerous allegations that DRM, DRI, and US  
2 Collection suffered injuries as a result of the defendants' conduct.<sup>43</sup> But Diamond's blanket  
3 allegation that DRC "ultimately subsumes all the losses of its underlying development entities,  
4 and therefore, all of the damages, both current and future, as a result of litigation are  
5 encapsulated with DRC" undermines the allegations of injury to DRM, DRI, and US Collection,  
6 making them implausible.<sup>44</sup> Although the fact that DRM, DRI, and US Collection are not  
7 development entities distinguishes the first part of the allegation, it does not explain Diamond's  
8 allegation that "all of the damages, both current and future, as a result of litigation are  
9 encapsulated with DRC." So I grant the motions to dismiss DRM, DRI, and US Collection's  
10 claims. But I grant leave to amend because Judge Boulware did not identify this deficiency in  
11 Diamond's initial complaint and it does not appear that amendment would be futile.<sup>45</sup>

12 **C. Intentional Interference Claims<sup>46</sup>**

13 Happy Hour argues that Diamond fails to adequately plead its intentional interference  
14 with existing contractual relationships and intentional interference with prospective economic  
15 advantage claims because Diamond does not allege that Happy Hour intended timeshare  
16 purchasers to breach their agreements.<sup>47</sup> Diamond responds that the content of the  
17 advertisements themselves establish the elements of these claims.<sup>48</sup>

18  
19

---

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 120, 178, 185.

20<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 7.

21<sup>45</sup> See *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962).

22<sup>46</sup> The TET defendants do not move to dismiss Diamond's intentional interference with existing  
contractual relations and intentional interference with prospective economic advantage claims.

23<sup>47</sup> ECF No. 88 at 9-12.

<sup>48</sup> ECF No. 97 at 6-7.

Under Nevada law, a claim for intentional interference with contractual relations requires proof of four elements: “(1) a valid and existing contract; (2) the defendant’s knowledge of the contract; (3) intentional acts intended or designed to disrupt the contractual relationship; (4) actual disruption of the contract; and (5) resulting damage.”<sup>49</sup> A claim for interference with prospective economic advantage under Nevada law requires proof of five elements: (1) a prospective contractual relationship between the plaintiff and a third party; (2) the defendant knew of the prospective relationship; (3) the defendant intended to harm the plaintiff by preventing the relationship; (4) the defendant’s conduct was not privileged or justified; and (5) the plaintiff suffered actual harm as a result.<sup>50</sup>

Diamond alleges that Happy Hour created advertisements for TET that establish the elements of these claims. The advertisements solicit individuals who are parties to timeshare contracts with Diamond on the premise that TET can help them exit those contracts, suggesting knowledge of a contract and intent to disrupt it. And Diamond alleges that Happy Hour knew Diamond timeshare owners often upgraded their timeshares,<sup>51</sup> suggesting knowledge of prospective economic advantage and subsequent intent to harm by preventing the upgraded timeshares. The factual allegations do not suggest the presence of privilege or justification. Diamond also alleges actual harm from Happy Hour’s intentional interference with existing and prospective business relationships.<sup>52</sup> So Diamond sufficiently pleads intentional interference

---

<sup>49</sup> *J.J. Indus., LLC v. Bennett*, 71 P.3d 1264, 1267 (Nev. 2003) (quoting *Sutherland v. Gross*, 772 P.2d 1287, 1290 (Nev. 1989)).

<sup>50</sup> *In re Amerco Deriv. Litig.*, 252 P.3d 681, 702 (Nev. 2011) (en banc).

<sup>51</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 164-165.

<sup>52</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 171.

1 with existing contractual relationships and intentional interference with prospective economic  
2 advantage under the Rule 8 standard applicable to these claims.

3       **D. False Advertising**

4       The TET defendants and Happy Hour argue that Diamond's Lanham Act false  
5 advertising claims should be dismissed because there are no actionable false or misleading  
6 statements, Diamond fails to plead the false or misleading statements with particularity,  
7 Diamond fails to plead causation, Diamond's contributory false advertising claim against Happy  
8 Hour has not been recognized in the Ninth Circuit, and Happy Hour did not materially participate  
9 in the false advertising.<sup>53</sup> Diamond responds that the alleged false or misleading statements are  
10 actionable and pleaded with particularity, it has sufficiently alleged causation, and that its  
11 contributory false advertising claim against Happy Hour is cognizable and sufficiently pleaded.<sup>54</sup>

12           *1. Actionable False or Misleading Statements*

13       Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act creates a federal remedy against a person who, in  
14 connection with any goods or services, uses a "false designation of origin, false or misleading  
15 description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact" in commercial advertising that  
16 misrepresents the nature, characteristics, or qualities of the goods or services.<sup>55</sup> Under this  
17 section, only non-puffing "statements of fact capable of being proved false" are actionable.<sup>56</sup>  
18 "Puffing" is exaggerated advertising, blustering, and boasting upon which no reasonable buyer  
19 would rely and is not actionable under § 43(a).<sup>57</sup> "To demonstrate falsity within the meaning of  
20

---

21       <sup>53</sup> ECF No. 87 at 6-16; ECF No. 88 at 12-16.

22       <sup>54</sup> ECF No. 96 at 6-17; ECF No. 97 at 8-11.

23       <sup>55</sup> 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

24       <sup>56</sup> *Coastal Abstract Serv., Inc. v. First Am. Title Ins. Co.*, 173 F.3d 725, 731 (9th Cir. 1999).

25       <sup>57</sup> *Southland Sod Farms v. Stover Seed Co.*, 108 F.3d 1134, 1145 (9th Cir. 1997).

1 the Lanham Act, a plaintiff may show that the statement was literally false, either on its face or  
2 by necessary implication, or that the statement was literally true but likely to mislead or confuse  
3 consumers.”<sup>58</sup> To show that an advertisement was likely to mislead or confuse consumers,  
4 Diamond must allege that the advertisement “has misled, confused, or deceived the consuming  
5 public.”<sup>59</sup>

6 Diamond has sufficiently alleged that each of the five categories of statements was false  
7 or misleading. Diamond adequately alleges that TET’s advertisements that it could “exit” or  
8 “cancel” a customer’s timeshare interest were literally false because TET could not provide such  
9 relief without Diamond’s consent or misleading because Diamond owners were deceived into  
10 thinking that TET’s services could lead to lawful release, termination, cancellation, or transfer of  
11 a timeshare contract.<sup>60</sup> Diamond alleges TET’s advertisements that it had a “process” or  
12 “method” resulting in termination of a timeshare agreement were misleading because they  
13 suggest that TET had a proprietary method when in reality TET’s method often involved breach  
14 and subsequent foreclosure.<sup>61</sup> TET’s claims that its services were “legal,” “lawful,” “legitimate,”  
15 or “safe” were also misleading because they deceived owners into thinking that TET’s services  
16 could lead to a lawful release, termination, cancellation, or transfer of a timeshare contract rather  
17 than the breach of contract and foreclosure that TET often induced.<sup>62</sup> Diamond also alleges that

---

18  
58 *Id.* at 1139.

19  
59 *Id.* at 1140.

20  
60 ECF No. 59 at ¶ 96-97.

21  
61 *Id.*

22  
62 *Id.* The defendants argue that these statements are literally true because breach of contract is  
23 not unlawful under the efficient breach theory of contract law. These statements make out a  
plausible claim for relief because Diamond alleges why they were misleading, *id.*, and on a  
motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim I must accept all well-pleaded allegations as true. In  
any event, breach of contract without legal excuse may be described as unlawful or illegal,  
suggesting that dismissal on this ground is premature. See 23 Williston on Contracts § 63:1 (4th

1 TET’s advertisements of a “guarantee” are false because that result requires Diamond’s consent  
2 or misleading because Diamond owners were deceived into thinking that TET’s guarantee  
3 promised a release other than breach and foreclosure.<sup>63</sup> Finally, Diamond sufficiently alleges  
4 TET’s claims that its services allowed timeshare owners to be completely free of unwanted  
5 obligations were false because that result requires Diamond’s consent.<sup>64</sup>

6 Nor do the allegedly false or misleading statements constitute non-actionable puffery. In  
7 this context, where customers face purportedly lifetime obligations to Diamond, a reasonable  
8 buyer would rely on TET’s various claims regarding its service to terminate those lifetime  
9 obligations. Diamond has also pleaded these false statements with particularity by pointing to  
10 specific statements visible on TET’s website and setting forth why each statement is false or  
11 misleading.<sup>65</sup> Diamond does not identify when or how long the statements appeared on the  
12 website, but this information is within TET’s control and ascertainable on the basis of the  
13 allegations. In sum, Diamond’s allegations give “notice of the particular misconduct which is  
14 alleged to constitute the fraud charged so that [the defendants] can defend against the charge and  
15 not just deny that [they have] done anything wrong.”<sup>66</sup> So I deny the defendants’ motions on this  
16 ground.

17

---

18 ed.) (“[A] breach of contract is a failure, without legal excuse, to perform any promise that forms  
19 the whole or part of a contract.”); *cf.* Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 1 (1981) (“A contract  
20 is a promise or a set of promises for the breach of which the law gives a remedy, or the  
performance of which the law in some way recognizes as a duty.”).

21<sup>63</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶ 96-97.

22<sup>64</sup> *Id.* The defendants argue that this claim is contradicted by customer agreements, but weighing  
the effect of the claims and customer agreements is a fact-intensive inquiry that is inappropriate  
on a motion to dismiss.

23<sup>65</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 96.

<sup>66</sup> *Lungwitz*, 616 F.3d at 999.

1                   2. *Causation*

2         Judge Boulware dismissed Diamond's Lanham Act claim in its initial complaint because  
3 it failed to plead causation between the alleged false statements and reputational harm to  
4 Diamond.<sup>67</sup> The defendants argue that Diamond again fails to plead causation between the false  
5 statements and its injuries.<sup>68</sup> Diamond responds that because it does not assert claims for  
6 reputational injury in its amended complaint, it need only allege that the false statements caused  
7 economic injuries.<sup>69</sup>

8         In *Lexmark International, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.*, the Supreme Court of  
9 the United States outlined a two-part test for who has the right to bring a Lanham Act false  
10 advertising claim.<sup>70</sup> First, to come within the zone of interests protected by the Act, the plaintiff  
11 must "allege an injury to a commercial interest in reputation or sales."<sup>71</sup> Second, to establish  
12 proximate cause, the plaintiff must allege "economic or reputational injury flowing directly from  
13 the deception wrought by the defendant's advertising; and that that occurs when deception of  
14 consumers causes them to withhold trade from the plaintiff."<sup>72</sup> The Supreme Court specifically  
15 rejected the Ninth Circuit's test of whether the plaintiff and defendant were direct competitors,  
16 explaining that it "provides a bright-line rule; but it does so at the expense of distorting the  
17 statutory language."<sup>73</sup>

18  
19

---

<sup>67</sup> ECF No. 49.

20

<sup>68</sup> ECF No. 87 at 14-16; ECF No. 88 at 15.

21

<sup>69</sup> ECF No. 96 at 13-15.

22

<sup>70</sup> 572 U.S. 118 (2014).

23

<sup>71</sup> *Id.* at 131-32.

<sup>72</sup> *Id.* at 133.

<sup>73</sup> *Id.* at 124, 136.

1 Diamond's central allegation is that TET solicited Diamond customers with deceptive  
2 advertisements and then induced them to breach their contracts with Diamond, thereby alleging  
3 an injury to its commercial interest in sales and bringing Diamond's claim within the zone of  
4 interests protected by the Lanham Act. And this injury flows directly from TET's allegedly  
5 deceptive advertisements of its own service, so Diamond also pleads proximate cause. The  
6 defendants argue in reply that Diamond must allege a competitive injury, but they rely on Ninth  
7 Circuit decisions that predate *Lexmark*.<sup>74</sup> So Diamond has adequately alleged that the  
8 defendants' false statements caused its injuries.

9       3. *Contributory False Advertising*

10     Diamond asserts a "contributory false advertising" claim against Happy Hour.<sup>75</sup>  
11 Although the Ninth Circuit has yet to recognize contributory liability for false advertising in  
12 violation of the Lanham Act, the Eleventh Circuit and a district court in the Ninth Circuit have  
13 recognized such a cause of action.<sup>76</sup> Under the Eleventh Circuit's elements of the claim, the  
14 plaintiff "must show that a third party in fact directly engaged in false advertising that injured the  
15 plaintiff" and "allege that the defendant contributed to that conduct either by knowingly inducing  
16 or causing the conduct, or by materially participating in it."<sup>77</sup> I apply these elements because  
17 they reflect the Ninth Circuit's test for contributory liability in other contexts.<sup>78</sup>

18  
19

---

<sup>74</sup> ECF No. 101 at 7.

20     <sup>75</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 199-209.

21     <sup>76</sup> *Duty Free Americas, Inc. v. Estee Lauder Companies, Inc.*, 797 F.3d 1248, 1277 (11th Cir.  
22     2015); *ADT Sec. Servs., Inc. v. Sec. One Int'l, Inc.*, No. 11-CV-05149 YGR, 2012 WL 4068632,  
at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2012).

23     <sup>77</sup> *Duty Free Americas*, 797 F.3d at 1277.

24     <sup>78</sup> See, e.g., *Ellison v. Robertson*, 357 F.3d 1072, 1076 (9th Cir. 2004) ("One who, with  
knowledge of the infringing activity, induces, causes or materially contributes to the infringing

1 As discussed above, Diamond has alleged that the TET defendants engaged in false  
2 advertising in violation of the Lanham Act, so they satisfy the first element. As for material  
3 participation, Diamond alleges that Happy Hour was formed by Reed and Hein as TET's "in-  
4 house marketing agency" and subsequently created and distributed TET's advertising campaigns  
5 online and through radio, television, and print media and other avenues.<sup>79</sup> Diamond also alleges  
6 that Happy Hour had knowledge of the false advertising.<sup>80</sup> So Diamond has adequately pleaded  
7 a contributory false advertising claim against Happy Hour.

8       **E. NDTPA Claim**

9       Judge Boulware noted that Diamond's initial NDTPA claim failed to "specifically  
10 identif[y] which sections and what would be the nature of the claim."<sup>81</sup> Diamond's amended  
11 complaint again fails to specify which of the various enumerated deceptive trade practices the  
12 defendants engaged in.<sup>82</sup> In opposing the motion, Diamond lists several deceptive trade practices  
13 and the factual allegations supporting those claims.<sup>83</sup> But Diamond is required to identify  
14 violations of the NDTPA and the facts supporting those alleged violations in its complaint.<sup>84</sup>

15  
16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 conduct of another may be liable as a contributory copyright infringer." (quotations and  
19 alternations omitted)).

20       <sup>79</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 20, 94, 104-105.

21       <sup>80</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 203-205.

22       <sup>81</sup> ECF No. 49 at 4.

23       <sup>82</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 210-17.

24       <sup>83</sup> ECF No. 96 at 17-18.

25       <sup>84</sup> See *Teodoro v. Allstate Fire & Cas. Ins. Co.*, No. 217-CV-02135-APG-VCF, 2018 WL  
26 1786818, at \*4 (D. Nev. Apr. 13, 2018) (dismissing claim where plaintiff did not identify  
27 specific violations of the NDTPA); *Reyes v. GMAC Mortg. LLC*, No. 2:11-CV-100-JCM-RJJ,  
28 2011 WL 1322775, at \*3 (D. Nev. Apr. 5, 2011) (same).

1 And because Rule 9(b) applies to these fraud-based NDTPA claims, Diamond is required to  
2 plead them with particularity. So I grant the defendants' motions on this ground.

3 In the hearing on the previous motions to dismiss, Judge Boulware identified these  
4 pleading deficiencies in the NDTPA claim and made clear that he wanted to review only one  
5 amended complaint.<sup>85</sup> He therefore gave Diamond almost six months to file an amended  
6 complaint. Yet Diamond failed to address these defects. I will give Diamond one final chance  
7 to properly plead this claim by way of amending its complaint.

8 **F. Civil Conspiracy Claims**

9 The moving defendants argue that Diamond's civil conspiracy claims should be  
10 dismissed because there are insufficient factual allegations to support them and the intra-  
11 corporate conspiracy doctrine applies.<sup>86</sup> Diamond responds that it alleges numerous specific acts  
12 and that the intra-corporate conspiracy doctrine does not apply because Hein, Parenteau, and  
13 Reed were acting as individuals for their own advantage and Happy Hour is a distinct entity.<sup>87</sup>

14 Under Nevada law, a civil conspiracy "consists of a combination of two or more persons  
15 who, by some concerted action, intend to accomplish an unlawful objective for the purpose of  
16 harming another, and damage results from the act or acts."<sup>88</sup> Diamond must allege two elements  
17 to plead a claim for civil conspiracy: (1) the commission of an underlying tort and (2) an  
18 agreement between the defendants to commit that tort.<sup>89</sup> However, "agents and employees of a

20

---

<sup>85</sup> ECF No. 49 at 25-26.

21<sup>86</sup> ECF No. 87 at 19-22; ECF No. 88 at 17-20.

22<sup>87</sup> ECF No. 96 at 18-20; ECF No. 97 at 12-14.

23<sup>88</sup> *Consol. Generator-Nevada, Inc. v. Cummins Engine Co.*, 971 P.2d 1251, 1256 (Nev. 1998) (quotation omitted).

<sup>89</sup> *GES, Inc. v. Corbitt*, 21 P.3d 11, 15 (Nev. 2001).

1 corporation cannot conspire with their corporate principal or employer where they act in their  
2 official capacities on behalf of the corporation and not as individuals for their individual  
3 advantage.”<sup>90</sup>

4       The moving defendants point to this court’s decision in *Sharda v. Sunrise Hospital &*  
5 *Medical Center, LLC* indicating that Diamond must “plead with particular specificity as to ‘the  
6 manner in which a defendant joined in the conspiracy and how he participated in it.’”<sup>91</sup> But the  
7 case *Sharda* quotes addresses claims for civil conspiracy to commit fraud, invoking Rule 9(b)’s  
8 requirement of stating the circumstances constituting fraud “with particularity.”<sup>92</sup> The civil  
9 conspiracy claim here is predicated on Diamond’s intentional interference claims, so I apply the  
10 Rule 8 pleading standard.<sup>93</sup>

11       Diamond’s amended complaint alleges an agreement to interfere with existing and  
12 prospective contractual relations<sup>94</sup> and provides descriptions of individualized behavior in  
13 furtherance of that goal.<sup>95</sup> Reading the amended complaint as a whole, the defendants have fair  
14 notice under Rule 8, and Diamond has established a basis for the claim. And the intra-corporate  
15 conspiracy doctrine does not bar dismissal for two reasons: (1) Diamond alleges that Reed, Hein,  
16  
17  
18

---

19       <sup>90</sup> *Collins v. Union Fe. Sav. & Loan Ass’n*, 662 P.2d 610, 622 (Nev. 1983).

20       <sup>91</sup> *Sharda v. Sunrise Hosp. & Med. Ctr., LLC*, No. 2:16-CV-2233-JCM-GWF, 2017 WL  
2870086, at \*10 (D. Nev. July 3, 2017) (quoting *Arroyo v. Wheat*, 591 F. Supp. 141, 144 (D.  
Nev. 1984)).

21       <sup>92</sup> *Arroyo*, 591 F. Supp. at 144 (D. Nev. 1984).

22       <sup>93</sup> ECF No. 59 at ¶¶ 221-223.

23       <sup>94</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 220-21, 223.

24       <sup>95</sup> See, e.g., *id.* at ¶¶ 42-53 (TET); *id.* at ¶¶ 37, 124, 128-29 (Reed); *id.* at ¶¶ 37, 132, 136 (Hein);  
*id.* at 137 (Parenteau); *id.* at ¶¶ 105, 206 (Happy Hour).

1 and Parenteau acted as individuals for their own individual financial advantage<sup>96</sup> and (2) Happy  
2 Hour is a separate corporate entity<sup>97</sup> that is not a TET subsidiary.<sup>98</sup> So I deny the defendants'  
3 motions to dismiss on these grounds.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 I THEREFORE ORDER that Brandon Reed, Trevor Hein, Thomas Parenteau, and Reed  
6 Hein & Associates, LLC dba Timeshare Exit Team's motion to dismiss [ECF No. 87] and  
7 Happy Hour Media Group, LLC's motion to dismiss [ECF No. 88] are GRANTED in part.  
8 The plaintiffs' NDTPA claim (Count VI) is dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiffs Diamond  
9 Resorts, International, Inc.; Diamond Resorts U.S. Collection Development, LLC; and Diamond  
10 Resorts Management, Inc. are dismissed without prejudice.

11 I FURTHER ORDER that the plaintiffs may file an amended complaint by December 23,  
12 2019 to properly plead the NDTPA claim and address the standing to bring suit of Diamond  
13 Resorts, International, Inc., Diamond Resorts U.S. Collection Development, LLC, and Diamond  
14 Resorts Management, Inc.

15 I FURTHER ORDER that the plaintiffs' motion for leave to file notice of supplemental  
16 authority [ECF No. 104] is DENIED.

17 DATED this 25th day of November, 2019.



18  
19  
20 ANDREW P. GORDON  
21  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
55210  
55211  
55212  
55213  
55214  
55215  
55216  
55217  
55218  
55219  
55220  
55221  
55222  
55223  
55224  
55225  
55226  
55227  
55228  
55229  
55230  
55231  
55232  
55233  
55234  
55235  
55236  
55237  
55238  
55239  
55240  
55241  
55242  
55243  
55244  
55245  
55246  
55247  
55248  
55249  
55250  
55251  
55252  
55253  
55254  
55255  
55256  
55257  
55258  
55259  
55260  
55261  
55262  
55263  
55264  
55265  
55266  
55267  
55268  
55269  
55270  
55271  
55272  
55273  
55274  
55275  
55276  
55277  
55278  
55279  
55280  
55281  
55282  
55283  
55284  
55285  
55286  
55287  
55288  
55289  
55290  
55291  
55292  
55293  
55294  
55295  
55296  
55297  
55298  
55299  
552100  
552101  
552102  
552103  
552104  
552105  
552106  
552107  
552108  
552109  
552110  
552111  
552112  
552113  
552114  
552115  
552116  
552117  
552118  
552119  
552120  
552121  
552122  
552123  
552124  
552125  
552126  
552127  
552128  
552129  
552130  
552131  
552132  
552133  
552134  
552135  
552136  
552137  
552138  
552139  
552140  
552141  
552142  
552143  
552144  
552145  
552146  
552147  
552148  
552149  
552150  
552151  
552152  
552153  
552154  
552155  
552156  
552157  
552158  
552159  
552160  
552161  
552162  
552163  
552164  
552165  
552166  
552167  
552168  
552169  
552170  
552171  
552172  
552173  
552174  
552175  
552176  
552177  
552178  
552179  
552180  
552181  
552182  
552183  
552184  
552185  
552186  
552187  
552188  
552189  
552190  
552191  
552192  
552193  
552194  
552195  
552196  
552197  
552198  
552199  
552200  
552201  
552202  
552203  
552204  
552205  
552206  
552207  
552208  
552209  
552210  
552211  
552212  
552213  
552214  
552215  
552216  
552217  
552218  
552219  
552220  
552221  
552222  
552223  
552224  
552225  
552226  
552227  
552228  
552229  
5522210  
5522211  
5522212  
5522213  
5522214  
5522215  
5522216  
5522217  
5522218  
5522219  
5522220  
5522221  
5522222  
5522223  
5522224  
5522225  
5522226  
5522227  
5522228  
5522229  
55222210  
55222211  
55222212  
55222213  
55222214  
55222215  
55222216  
55222217  
55222218  
55222219  
55222220  
55222221  
55222222  
55222223  
55222224  
55222225  
55222226  
55222227  
55222228  
55222229  
552222210  
552222211  
552222212  
552222213  
552222214  
552222215  
552222216  
552222217  
552222218  
552222219  
552222220  
552222221  
552222222  
552222223  
552222224  
552222225  
552222226  
552222227  
552222228  
552222229  
5522222210  
5522222211  
5522222212  
5522222213  
5522222214  
5522222215  
5522222216  
5522222217  
5522222218  
5522222219  
5522222220  
5522222221  
5522222222  
5522222223  
5522222224  
5522222225  
5522222226  
5522222227  
5522222228  
5522222229  
55222222210  
55222222211  
55222222212  
55222222213  
55222222214  
55222222215  
55222222216  
55222222217  
55222222218  
55222222219  
55222222220  
55222222221  
55222222222  
55222222223  
55222222224  
55222222225  
55222222226  
55222222227  
55222222228  
55222222229  
552222222210  
552222222211  
552222222212  
552222222213  
552222222214  
552222222215  
552222222216  
552222222217  
552222222218  
552222222219  
552222222220  
552222222221  
552222222222  
552222222223  
552222222224  
552222222225  
552222222226  
552222222227  
552222222228  
552222222229  
5522222222210  
5522222222211  
5522222222212  
5522222222213  
5522222222214  
5522222222215  
5522222222216  
5522222222217  
5522222222218  
5522222222219  
5522222222220  
5522222222221  
5522222222222  
5522222222223  
5522222222224  
5522222222225  
5522222222226  
5522222222227  
5522222222228  
5522222222229  
55222222222210  
55222222222211  
55222222222212  
55222222222213  
55222222222214  
55222222222215  
55222222222216  
55222222222217  
55222222222218  
55222222222219  
55222222222220  
55222222222221  
55222222222222  
55222222222223  
55222222222224  
55222222222225  
55222222222226  
55222222222227  
55222222222228  
55222222222229  
552222222222210  
552222222222211  
552222222222212  
552222222222213  
552222222222214  
552222222222215  
552222222222216  
552222222222217  
552222222222218  
552222222222219  
552222222222220  
552222222222221  
552222222222222  
552222222222223  
552222222222224  
552222222222225  
552222222222226  
552222222222227  
552222222222228  
552222222222229  
5522222222222210  
5522222222222211  
5522222222222212  
5522222222222213  
5522222222222214  
5522222222222215  
5522222222222216  
5522222222222217  
5522222222222218  
5522222222222219  
5522222222222220  
5522222222222221  
5522222222222222  
5522222222222223  
5522222222222224  
5522222222222225  
5522222222222226  
5522222222222227  
5522222222222228  
5522222222222229  
55222222222222210  
55222222222222211  
55222222222222212  
55222222222222213  
55222222222222214  
55222222222222215  
55222222222222216  
55222222222222217  
55222222222222218  
55222222222222219  
55222222222222220  
55222222222222221  
55222222222222222  
55222222222222223  
55222222222222224  
55222222222222225  
55222222222222226  
55222222222222227  
55222222222222228  
55222222222222229  
552222222222222210  
552222222222222211  
552222222222222212  
552222222222222213  
552222222222222214  
552222222222222215  
552222222222222216  
552222222222222217  
552222222222222218  
552222222222222219  
552222222222222220  
552222222222222221  
552222222222222222  
552222222222222223  
552222222222222224  
552222222222222225  
552222222222222226  
552222222222222227  
552222222222222228  
552222222222222229  
5522222222222222210  
5522222222222222211  
5522222222222222212  
5522222222222222213  
5522222222222222214  
5522222222222222215  
5522222222222222216  
5522222222222222217  
5522222222222222218  
5522222222222222219  
5522222222222222220  
5522222222222222221  
5522222222222222222  
5522222222222222223  
5522222222222222224  
5522222222222222225  
5522222222222222226  
5522222222222222227  
5522222222222222228  
5522222222222222229  
55222222222222222210  
55222222222222222211  
55222222222222222212  
55222222222222222213  
55222222222222222214  
55222222222222222215  
55222222222222222216  
55222222222222222217  
55222222222222222218  
55222222222222222219  
55222222222222222220  
55222222222222222221  
55222222222222222222  
55222222222222222223  
55222222222222222224  
55222222222222222225  
55222222222222222226  
55222222222222222227  
55222222222222222228  
55222222222222222229  
552222222222222222210  
552222222222222222211  
552222222222222222212  
552222222222222222213  
552222222222222222214  
552222222222222222215  
552222222222222222216  
552222222222222222217  
552222222222222222218  
552222222222222222219  
552222222222222222220  
552222222222222222221  
552222222222222222222  
552222222222222222223  
552222222222222222224  
552222222222222222225  
552222222222222222226  
552222222222222222227  
552222222222222222228  
552222222222222222229  
5522222222222222222210  
5522222222222222222211  
5522222222222222222212  
5522222222222222222213  
5522222222222222222214  
5522222222222222222215  
5522222222222222222216  
5522222222222222222217  
5522222222222222222218  
5522222222222222222219  
5522222222222222222220  
5522222222222222222221  
5522222222222222222222  
5522222222222222222223  
5522222222222222222224  
5522222222222222222225  
5522222222222222222226  
5522222222222222222227  
5522222222222222222228  
5522222222222222222229  
55222222222222222222210  
55222222222222222222211  
55222222222222222222212  
55222222222222222222213  
55222222222222222222214  
55222222222222222222215  
55222222222222222222216  
55222222222222222222217  
55222222222222222222218  
55222222222222222222219  
55222222222222222222220  
55222222222222222222221  
55222222222222222222222  
55222222222222222222223  
55222222222222222222224  
55222222222222222222225  
55222222222222222222226  
55222222222222222222227  
55222222222222222222228  
55222222222222222222229  
552222222222222222222210  
552222222222222222222211  
552222222222222222222212  
552222222222222222222213  
552222222222222222222214  
552222222222222222222215  
552222222222222222222216  
552222222222222222222217  
552222222222222222222218  
552222222222222222222219  
552222222222222222222220  
552222222222222222222221  
552222222222222222222222  
552222222222222222222223  
552222222222222222222224  
552222222222222222222225  
552222222222222222222226  
552222222222222222222227  
552222222222222222222228  
552222222222222222222229